

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6135

in many ways in recent years since the original TVA Act was passed.

Today TVA stands as a fruitful example of how democracy works and how a democratic society through utilization of its resources in a cooperative effort can uplift an entire region and its people. Today TVA is not only returning rich dividends to the people of the valley area and to the United States as a whole, but it is one of our Nation's most impressive showcases to the world. It stands, on its 30th birthday, not only as a symbol of democracy in action throughout the United States but as a monument of progress to other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Library of Congress to provide me with the names of the Members of Congress who are serving in Congress who originally voted for the TVA Act. These men—11 in number—who are continuing to serve in the Congress were among the real pioneers and statesmen who made this great development possible.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fitting and appropriate that the names of these original supporters of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act who are still serving in Congress be acknowledged and their names spread upon the record.

Those still in the Congress who supported and voted for the original TVA Act in 1933 include our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts; the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; the Honorable WILLIAM COLMER, of Mississippi, ranking member of the Committee on Rules; the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency; the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules; and the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

The Members of the other body who were in the Congress and voted for the bill in 1933 are Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona; Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama; and Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia.

These men—pioneer friends and supporters of TVA—are all great American statesmen.

Protest on Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 30, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently I signed a cable to Soviet Premier Khrushchev protesting anti-Semitism, which is official policy in the Soviet Union, and is encouraged by the state. The cable attempted to remind Premier Khrushchev that the Soviet Union's policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens is in direct contradiction to Khrushchev's oft-repeated claim that Russia is a so-

called champion of human dignity and equality.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release about this cable—the release is from the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Committee—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA RELIGIOUS, CIVIC LEADERS PROTEST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

PHILADELPHIA.—In a strongly worded cable to the Russian Ambassador in Washington, 42 Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen, educators, civic, and government officials in Philadelphia yesterday assailed Soviet anti-Semitism and urged the Russian Government "to lift its official policy of oppression against its Jewish citizens."

The telegram to the ambassador sent on the eve of the observance by Jews all over the world of the Day of Atonement was undertaken cooperatively by these leaders, the Board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Jewish Committee, a 56-year-old human relations agency.

Among the signers of the telegram were: Archbishop John J. Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia; Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, president of the World Methodist Council; Mayor James H. J. Tate and James T. McDermott, Republican candidate for mayor and Rabbi Morris Pickholz, president, board of rabbis of Greater Philadelphia.

The Philadelphia leaders sharply criticized the blanket restraints against all religions in the U.S.S.R. They underscored that Judaism is placed outside even the narrow framework of permissible religious practice allowed in the Soviet Union.

Leaders from the following fields—all of whom signed the cable in their individual capacities—were: Religion: Arlin M. Adams, chairman of the board, Philadelphia Chapter, American Jewish Committee; Rev. J. A. Alexander, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rt. Rev. J. Gillespie Armstrong, bishop of Pennsylvania, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rt. Rev. George W. Baber, bishop, African Methodist Episcopal Church; the Rev. Dr. Henry H. Bagger, president emeritus, Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia; Rev. J. S. Benn, Jr., presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rabbi Israel Botwinick, president, Rabbinical Association (Orthodox); Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, president of the World Methodist Council; Rev. C. Paul Felton, district superintendent, Philadelphia Methodist Conference; Dr. Aaron E. Gast, dean, Conwell School of Theology; Robert K. Greenfield, president, Jewish Community Relations Council; J. Arthur Hookway, moderator, Philadelphia Baptist Association; Rev. A. Scott Hutchison, executive secretary, Philadelphia Baptist Association; Rev. Matthew Jones, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. Samuel E. Kidd, president, eastern Pennsylvania Synod of the Lutheran Church in America; the Most Rev. Archbishop John R. J. Krol, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Rabbi Reuben J. Magil, president, Philadelphia branch of Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative); Rev. Arnold D. Nearn, presiding elder, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rev. Henry H. Nichols, president, Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches; David G. Paul, clerk, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends; Clarence E. Pickett, secretary emeritus, American Friends Service Committee; Rabbi Morris Pickholz, president, board of Rabbis of Greater Philadelphia; Rabbi Arthur J. S. Rosenbaum, chairman, Community Relations Committee, Board of Rabbis; Dr. E. Preston Sharp, moderator of the Philadelphia Presbytery; Rev. Paul T. Slinghoff, president,

southeast Pennsylvania Conference of the United Church of Christ; Dr. Samuel L. Spear, president, Baptist Ministers Conference of Philadelphia and vicinity; Rev. F. H. Stroup, executive secretary, Philadelphia Presbytery; Rev. Leon M. Sullivan, pastor, Zion Baptist Church; Rabbi Harold M. Waintrub, chairman, Philadelphia Association of Reform Rabbis; Rev. Henry W. Zehner, superintendent, Atlantic Conference, Evangelical United Brethren Church.

Civic and Government. Senator Joseph S. Clark; Senator Hugh Scott; Samuel L. Evans, manager, Philadelphia Chamber Orchestra; W. Thatcher Longstreth; president, Urban League; the Honorable Thomas B. McBride, president, Fellowship Commission; James T. McDermott, Esq., Republican candidate for mayor; Cecil B. Moore, Esq., president, Philadelphia Branch, NAACP; Mayor James H. J. Tate.

Education. Brother Daniel Bernian, president, LaSalle College; Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president, Temple University; Rev. John A. Klekotka, president, Villanova University; and the Very Rev. William F. Maloney, president, St. Joseph's College.

The leaders pointed out the sharp contrast between the Soviet Constitution, in which equality of citizens is guaranteed, and the Soviet Government's persistent enmity to religion. Devout members of any religion, the statement said, "suffer harassment."

The telegram, delivered to the Soviet Embassy in Washington for transmission to Premier Khrushchev, charged that while most other faiths are permitted bare necessities needed for religious practices, the almost 3 million Jews of the Soviet Union are denied minimal rights.

Among the repressive measures against Jews in the Soviet Union listed in the cable were:

"Legally constituted Jewish congregations are isolated from one another. They are forbidden to organize a central body. They are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries. Their leaders are singled out for abuse.

"Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for the alleged crime of meeting with foreign visitors in their synagogues.

"Scores of synagogues have been closed by the state. The few that remain are served by rabbis who were ordained more than 40 years ago. For more than a generation, Jewish theological seminaries have been banned, except for a lone Yeshiva in Moscow, opened in 1956. Its enrollment, never permitted to exceed 20, was reduced to 4 in April.

"No Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years. No articles for Jewish ritual can be produced. This year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread, essential to observance of the Passover, was banned. The prayers of Judaism are said in Hebrew, yet the teaching of that language is forbidden.

"Although half a million Jews declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the Soviet census of 1959, their hundreds of schools, their once-flourishing theaters have been stamped out. Much smaller ethnic or linguistic groups have schools, theaters, books and newspapers in their own languages."

The conditions, the cable said, revive "memories of the anti-Semitic Stalin regime" which, it pointed out, Premier Khrushchev has denounced.

The telegram urged Soviet Union to implement its oft-repeated claim that it is "a champion of human dignity and equality" and "a defender of minority rights" by lifting these repressive measures. It called on the Soviet Government to conform its behavior "to its own professed principles," and to the standards of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the con-

A6136

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 30

stitutions of enlightened countries which affirm that "freedom of conscience and expression is vested unconditionally in every human being."

Unless the Soviet Government takes steps to guarantee complete freedom of religious practice, the cable said, "it forfeits the confidence of all peoples."

"By deeds alone can your Government confirm that the Soviet Union in truth upholds the rights of minorities and the equal dignity of man."

Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], and I have often expressed our deep concern about events in the Panama Canal which threaten the safety and future usefulness of this vital link in our economic and defense considerations.

I would like to extend in the Record at this point an excellent statement on the situation from a recent Life Lines broadcast:

PANAMA CANAL

To most Americans it seems incredible that our Government would ever give any serious thought to surrendering our control over the Panama Canal. The great canal, almost certainly the most important waterway in the world, links the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and provides the only direct sea communication between our east and west coasts. It was built entirely by America and primarily for American use, though ships from every nation in the world pass through it every year. It is a keystone of defense and of trade.

The land through which the Panama Canal is cut, one of the wildest and least developed regions on earth, was worthless before the coming of the canal. Still we pay Panama \$2 million a year for it. The canal is the heart of Panama's economy and its only major source of wealth.

If any rights, either moral or legal, are left in the world, then we can claim by right the Panama Canal. Yet high officials in our Government and particularly in our State Department have outlined a policy of gradual dilution of American control over the Panama Canal. Their final goal is its so-called "internationalization."

Fidel Castro of Cuba has made it a primary objective of his policy to take control of the Panama Canal out of the hands of the United States. His goal is to have Panama nationalize the canal under the guidance of his agents. If our foreign policy were guided by reason and the national interest of America, such a plot would be laughable. Panama has an army of less than 1,000 men. Cuba is an island hundreds of miles away from Panama, and the United States has the greatest Navy in the world. No conceivable force that Castro and his henchmen in Panama could command—internal or external—would even begin to threaten our control of the canal. We will lose it only if we give it up. And if we give it up it will be for no reason at all except plain appeasement.

Nevertheless, we are seriously considering giving it up. Not, to be sure, directly to Castro; but to some international or regional grouping of nations. This is almost unbe-

lievable policy. It is directly contrary to the expressed will of Congress. No American President of either party has ever endorsed it. There is nothing to suggest that any measurable percentage of the American people now favor it or could ever be persuaded to favor it. Yet the policy exists.

The one-world view of the Panama Canal first came to the surface in 1960. Reports reached leading Members of Congress that the State Department (fresh from its delivery of Cuba to Castro in the preceding year) was now planning to weaken our claim of right to the Panama Canal Zone by permitting the flag of Panama to fly in the Zone next to the American flag. By ironclad treaty, the United States holds a perpetual lease on Canal Zone territory. But this did not seem to matter to the State Department. It worried about Panamanian agitators and, as usual, world opinion. The Department did not worry at all, it seemed, about American rights and the loss of prestige that always results from a surrender of rights. And the State Department also saw fit to violate completely the expressed mandate of the Congress.

In February 1960, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 380 to 12, adopted a resolution calling upon the State Department not to permit the flag of Panama to fly anywhere in the Panama Canal Zone. State Department officials cannily waited until Congress had adjourned and the Nation was in the midst of a Presidential election campaign; in late September 1960, our Ambassador in Panama ordered the flag of Panama flown beside the American flag in every part of the Canal Zone.

In the confusion of a National election and a change of administrations, no steps were taken to override this action and punish or even reprimand those responsible for it.

Naturally, this concession led only to more demands from agitators in Panama, egged on by Castro and encouraged by Castro's repeated successes against the United States. The flag issue, though important, had been only symbolic. Now America's critics and enemies began to insist on at least a share in actual control of the canal. Some of our policymakers were only too willing to oblige.

Increasingly ominous signs of a new weakening in our position on the Panama Canal are clearly to be seen. While in Panama, Adlai Stevenson, American Ambassador to the United Nations, said that "the logical future of the canal may be some form of internationalization. Senator WAYNE MORSE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America, sponsored a university study on the Panama Canal which concluded that the canal should be regionalized by being put under the control of every nation in the Western Hemisphere, acting as a group. Finally, this year, the State Department brought to Panama the secretary general of the Suez Canal Authority, who was the man who carried out the one-sided, forced nationalization of the Suez Canal on the orders of Nasser of Egypt. This official, so experienced in taking over canals that did not belong to him, lectured audiences in Panama on how it was done. And this was a man sent not by Castro or by the Kremlin or even by Nasser himself, but invited to Panama by our own State Department.

There are signs enough to indicate that the incredible may be about to happen again. Five years ago it could hardly have seemed possible to anyone that the United States would ever permit the establishment of a Soviet-armed Communist satellite on our very doorstep in Cuba. But this took place. And, unless the present trend is reversed, the same sort of disaster and surrender could happen in Panama.

Before Congress, as one answer to the policy of retreat and surrender on the Panama Canal, is a resolution demanding that our "ownership and protection" of the

canal remain unimpaired. But in view of the way the last congressional resolution of this kind was treated—directly violated as soon as Congress had adjourned—it is too much to hope that this action alone will be enough. The policy of backdown and appeasement in Panama is no more than an especially flagrant example of this same policy in most of the rest of the world. Never in American history has our foreign policy been so completely irrational. In faraway places on the enemy borders, as in West Berlin and South Vietnam, we try to stand firm, risking and even sacrificing lives to that end. But close to home, where our most vital interests are concerned, we make one needless concession after another to a foe who can scarcely believe his own good fortune.

There is good reason to suppose that the worst examples of the policy of concession and retreat as in the Panama Canal, are not the result of clear-cut decisions taken at the highest level of Government. Instead, they are the product of the middle echelon of the State Department—called the "fourth floor" by our last Ambassador to Cuba before Castro's takeover, who fought them long but in vain. The deskmen on the "fourth floor" make the day-to-day decisions of our foreign policy, especially in countries which, because of crises elsewhere, are not getting the personal attention of the President, his Cabinet, and other members of the National Security Council. The men of the "fourth floor" are almost all career foreign service officials, the product of a handful of eastern universities, most of them hired and trained during a period when it was widely and sincerely believed that international organizations could cure all the world's worst ills and that every nation should defer to them. The men of the "fourth floor" have built their careers on that false assumption. To give it up now would be to expose virtually everything they have done as a mistake. So they push steadily forward with their folly.

This type of thinking was clearly revealed in a recent speech by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, in which he welcomed what he called "the social revolution of the 19th and 20th centuries" and scorned "conservatism and silly resistance to change." It would be very interesting to know if the Governor's idea of the "social revolution of the 20th century" and the sort of change it is so silly to resist would include the surrender of the canal he is sworn to guard, to some international body. It is hard to explain such incidents as the visit of the man who carried out Nasser's orders to seize the Suez Canal, and the sponsorship of his visit by the American State Department on any other basis.

The facts about the downfall of Cuba, when joined with the facts about the changing status of our control over the Panama Canal, are surely enough to show that a great deal is deeply wrong at the working level of the State Department, and in the thinking of officials like the Governor of the Canal Zone. To give up the Panama Canal for no better reason than a desire to prove to everybody our limitless good will would be probably the most childish and self-defeating action any great power ever took.

Active patriots throughout America should keep a careful watch on this Panama Canal issue, often almost lost to sight in the turmoil of other events. Congressmen who stand up to protest our piecemeal surrender of our rights should get the public support they deserve by constructive groups of every kind. It should be made clear to the top officials in our Government that public opinion, especially after the disasters in Cuba, will not tolerate a new series of craven retreats in Panama. The situation is so serious, and the potential threat to American interests so great, that a full-scale congressional investigation would be fully